

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 5-29 and 31-45 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-2, 5-29 and 31-45 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 2, 5-11, 17-23, 39, and 40 have been amended. Claims 1, 24, 25-29, 31-38, 44, and 45 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The Applicants submit that claims 2, 5-23, and 39-43 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been entered by this amendment.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

Claims 25-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicants have cancelled claims 25-29 rendering the rejections thereof moot.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-2, 5-29, 31-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0033288 to Shanahan et al. (hereinafter "Shanahan") and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,816,882 B1 to Conner et al. (hereinafter "Conner"). Claims 1, 24, 25-29, 31-38, 44, and 45 have been cancelled by this amendment. The Applicants submit that claims 2, 5-23, and 39-43 are patentable over Shanahan in view of Conner for at least the reasons presented herein.

Independent claim 18 has been amended to include features previously recited in claims 1 and 17. Thus, no new matter has been entered. The Examiner states in the Office Action, that Conner teaches "integrating process software for providing said web-based electronic research and presentation functions via a document creation application, said integrating comprising: determining if said process software will execute on at least one server; identifying an address of said at least one server; checking said at least one server for operating systems, applications, and version numbers for validation with said process software, and identifying any missing software applications for said at least one server that are required for integration; updating said at least one server with respect to any operating system and application that is not validated for said process

software, and providing any of said missing software applications for said at least one server required for said integration; identifying client addresses and checking client computers for operating systems, applications, and version numbers for validation with said process software, and identifying any software applications missing from said client computers that are required for integration; updating said client computers with respect to any operating system and application that is not validated for said process software, and providing any missing software application for said client computers required for said integration; and installing said process software on said client computers and said at least one server,” citing columns 13-14 and Figures 8 and 9 in support. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Conner teaches, e.g., in column 8, lines 21-45, an application integration component 408 that “allows disparate applications, potentially written in different programming languages and built on different architectures, to communicate with each other” via three methods: connectors, messaging services and managed object services. Lines 31-45 of column 8 describe these methods of integration: gateway software linking applications, message brokering facilities including message transformations, and object wrappering of existing application logic written in any language. By contrast, the Applicants’ claimed invention provides integration by examining systems for missing software and providing the missing software to the respective device (e.g., such that each system is operating the same software or version of software). This is entirely different from gateway or linking software, message brokering and object wrappering, as disclosed in Conner. Thus, claim 18 is patentably distinct from Conner. Accordingly, the combination of Conner and Shanahan would not produce the features recited in Applicants’ claim 18. Claims 2, 5-17, and 19-22 depend from what should be an allowable base claim. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 5-17, and 19-22 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Notwithstanding the above-referenced dependencies, the Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over Shanahan and Conner in and of itself. Claim 11 recites “deploying process software for providing said web-based electronic research and presentation functions via a

document creation application, said deploying comprising: installing said process software on at least one server; identifying server addresses for users accessing said process software on said at least one server; installing a proxy server if needed; sending said process software to said at least one server and copying said process software to a file system of said at least one server; sending the process software to at least a first client computer; and executing said process software on said first client computer.” The Examiner states these features are recited in Conner. However, Conner discloses a prototypical three-tier architecture consisting of a client tier, Web application server, and servers to support the Web application server (column 6, lines 45-48). “The client tier contains logic related to the presentation of information (i.e., the graphical user interface) and requests to applications through a browser or Java applet. Web application servers contain the business logic...[and] servers support the Web application server, provide the data storage and transactional applications used by the Web application server processes” (column 6, lines 45-56). In addition, “Clients 480 supported by framework 400 are ‘thin clients’, meaning that little or no application logic is executed on the client and therefore relatively little software is required to be installed on the client” (column 7, lines 26-29). By contrast, the Applicants’ claim 11 recites sending process software to a client computer and executing the process software on the client computer. Thus, claim 11 does not recite a thin client as disclosed in Conner. For at least this reason, claim 11 is patentably distinct from Conner.

Claim 23 has been amended into independent form and recites features previously recited in what are now cancelled claims 1 and 24, as well as claim 18 prior to this amendment. Thus, no new matter has been entered. The Examiner states in the Office Action that Conner teaches “deploying, accessing, and executing process software for providing said web-based electronic research and presentation functions via a document creation application, said deploying, accessing, and executing process software implemented through a virtual private network, comprising: determining if a virtual private network is required; checking for remote access to said virtual private network when it is required; if said remote access does not exist, identifying a third party provider to provide secure, encrypted connections between a private network and remote users; identifying said remote users; setting up a network access server operable for

downloading and installing client software on desktop computers for remote access of said virtual private network; accessing said process software; transporting said process software to at least one remote user's desktop computer; executing said process software on said at least one remote user's desktop computer; determining if said virtual private network has a site-to-site configuration for providing site-to-site access, and if said virtual private network is not so available, installing equipment required to establish a site-to-site configuration for said virtual private network; installing large scale encryption into said site-to-site virtual private network; and accessing said process software through said site-to-site configuration with large scale encryption,” citing columns 13 and 14 in support. However, Conner generally discloses a security feature 631 that provides virtual private network (VPN) provisioning tasks (column 13, lines 40-42). There is no further teaching in Conner of how process software is deployed, accessed, and executed through a virtual private network. Conner is likewise devoid of teaching each and every feature: “determining if a virtual private network is required; checking for remote access to said virtual private network when it is required; if said remote access does not exist, identifying a third party provider to provide secure, encrypted connections between a private network and remote users; identifying said remote users; setting up a network access server operable for downloading and installing client software on desktop computers for remote access of said virtual private network; accessing said process software; transporting said process software to at least one remote user's desktop computer; executing said process software on said at least one remote user's desktop computer,” as recited in Applicants’ claim 23. Moreover, Conner makes no mention of site-to-site configuration with respect to a VPN. Thus, Conner may not be relied upon for teaching “determining if said virtual private network has a site-to-site configuration for providing site-to-site access, and if said virtual private network is not so available, installing equipment required to establish a site-to-site configuration for said virtual private network; installing large scale encryption into said site-to-site virtual private network; and accessing said process software through said site-to-site configuration with large scale encryption.” Accordingly, the combination of Shanahan and Conner would not yield the Applicants’ claim 23. For at least this reason, claim 23 is patentable over Shanahan and Conner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 39 has been amended to include features previously recited in what are now cancelled claims 31, 44, and 45. Thus, no new matter has been entered. Moreover, claim 39 has been amended in a manner substantially similar to that in claim 23. For at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 23, the Applicants submit that claim 39 is patentable over Shanahan and Conner. Claims 40-43 depend from what should be an allowable base claim. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 39-43 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested. It is submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks should render the case in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, as the cited references neither anticipate nor render obvious that which the Applicants deem to be the invention, it is respectfully requested that claims 2, 5-23, and 39-43 be passed to issue.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0458.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD E. KELLEY, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By /Marisa J. Dubuc/

Marisa J. Dubuc

Registration No. 46,673

Customer No. 29371

Date: October 26, 2007

Address: 55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone: (860) 286-2929

Fax: (860) 286-0115